UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	DOCUMENT ELECTRONICAL DOC #: DATE FILED: [O
OXFORD HEALTH INSURANCE, INC., et al.	
Plaintiffs, -against- DANIEL HAMNER, M.D., et al.,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION 13 Civ. 375 (AKH)
Defendants.	: : x
ALVIN K. HELLERSTEIN, U.S.D.J.:	4 R

On October 9, 2013, I entered an order denying defendants' motions to dismiss.

Defendant Allan Christopher as executor for the Estate of Anne M. Christopher (the "Christopher Estate") now moves for reconsideration of that order, repeating his arguments that he was not properly served and that he is separate from the Estate of Anne M. Christopher. The motion is denied.

"It is settled law in this District that a motion for reconsideration is n[ot] an occasion for repeating old arguments previously rejected," <u>Associated Press v. U.S. Dep't of Def.</u>, 395 F. Supp. 2d 17, 19 (S.D.N.Y. 2005), and the Christopher Estate's arguments were already rejected in my previous order. As I previously held, Connecticut General Statutes § 52-61 provides for service upon an estate through the probate court under these circumstances. The Christopher Estate's argument that the naming of the executor should alter that conclusion is meritless because, for purposes of service, there is no legal distinction to be made between the estate and its executor since the estate acts through its executor. Indeed, Connecticut General Statutes § 52-61 explicitly provides a mechanism for service upon an "executor." Accordingly, service upon the probate court satisfied Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(e)(1) in this case.

Case 1:13-cv-00375-AKH Document 64 Filed 10/24/13 Page 2 of 2

The Clerk shall mark the motion (Doc. No. 59) terminated.

SO ORDERED.

Dated:

New York, New York October 24, 2013

United States District Judge